

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

clu

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMAT		
10/512,020	10/19/2004	Ray Michael Geddens	BA9306USPCT	1951	
7590 09/22/2005			EXAMINER		
David E Heiser			QAZI, SABIHA NAIM		
	lemours and Company				
Legal - Patents		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
4417 Lancaster Pike			1616		
Wilmington, DE 19898			DATE MAILED: 09/22/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			J						
Office Action Summary			Application No.	cation No. Applicant(s)					
			10/512,020		GEDDENS ET AL.				
			Examiner		Art Unit				
			Sabiha Qazi		1616				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply									
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).									
Status	·								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on 19 Oc	tober 2004.	•					
·	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.								
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is								
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.									
Dispositi	on of Claims								
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are pending in the application.									
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.									
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.									
6) Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are rejected.									
	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.									
Applicati	on Papers								
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.									
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.									
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).									
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).									
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.									
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage</li> </ul>									
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).									
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.									
Attachment	(c)								
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)									
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date									
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or No(s)/Mail Date	PTO/SB/08)	_		atent Application (PTO	<b>)-152)</b>			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6)  Other:  S. Patent and Trademark Office									

U.S. Patent and Trademark United PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)

Application/Control Number: 10/512,020 Page 2

Art Unit: 1616

## **Non-Final Office Action**

Claims 1-15 are pending. No claim is allowed.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/512,020 Page 3

Art Unit: 1616

Claims 1-15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WALTER US

Patent 6,277,858. The reference teaches a fungicidal composition containing pyrimidine-4-one
derivatives and at least one or more compounds of various other classes of compounds suitable
for protecting plants against infestation by phytopathogenic microorganisms, in particular fungi.

See the entire document especially formula (I) in col. 1; lines 26-65 in col. 15; lines 41-67 in col.

16; lines 1-43 in col. 17; examples and claims. Furthermore, the reference teaches dinocap
(line19 in col. 17, as in formula III of claim 1). The reference also teaches the addition of further
compound such as fertilizers, micronutrient donors or other preparations, which influence the
growth of the plants. They can be selective herbicides as well as insecticides, fungicides,
bactericides, nematicides, molluscicides or mixtures of several preparations. See lines 41-50 in
col. 16.

Instant claims are selection of the prior art invention.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to prepare additional compositions containing Dinocap and pyrimidinone compounds because prior art teaches the combination of these two compounds i.e. compounds of formula I and III as presently claimed because prior art teaches all the components as presently claimed. In addition it teaches the addition of further active compounds as claimed in claims 9, 10, 14 and 15. Since no criticality and/or unexpected results are presented presently claimed invention is considered *prima facie* obvious over the prior art of record.

Application/Control Number: 10/512,020 Page 4

Art Unit: 1616

In the light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that

the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of

35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Sabiha Qazi whose telephone number is (571) 272-0622. The

examiner can normally be reached on any business day.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Gary Kunz can be reached on (571) 272-0887. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Friday, September 16, 2005

SABIHA QAZI, PH.D PRIMARY EXAMINER